

Summer 1984

## Book Reviews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Book Reviews, 75 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 506 (1984)

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

## BOOK REVIEWS

POLICING A CLASS SOCIETY: THE EXPERIENCE OF AMERICAN CITIES, 1865-1915. By *Sidney L. Harring*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1983. Pp. xii, 301. \$30.00.

Research on the historical development of American police has increased significantly in recent years. Social historians, however, have offered conflicting interpretations of the origin, operation, and impact of law enforcement agencies. Progressive historians have concluded that the development of nineteenth-century police agencies was a necessary and functional societal response to increasing crime and disorder, largely precipitated by the influx of immigrants, and that law enforcement agents generally were successful in reducing and preventing crime produced by these "dangerous classes." Marxist historians have concluded that the development of police institutions paralleled the maturation of capitalism and that the emergent law enforcement agencies served bourgeois interests by repressing the working class. Social context historians have provided eclectic, middle-range interpretations.<sup>1</sup>

Sidney L. Harring's *Policing a Class Society: The Experience of American Cities, 1865-1915* is a significant contribution to the literature that clarifies paradigmatic disputes. More specifically, Harring has provided a convincing Marxist analysis of the development, operation, and impact of local police institutions in major cities west of the Appalachian Mountains—Buffalo, Milwaukee, and Chicago, with secondary emphasis on Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, and a number of smaller cities—from 1865-1915. Harring is principally concerned with exposing the dynamic and dialectical relationship between the development of the capitalist political-economy, class conflict, and police institutions. Harring's radical thesis is unequivocal: the development of police institutions was directly correlated with the evolution of capitalism; law enforcement agencies protected the vested interests of the bourgeoisie by repressing,

---

<sup>1</sup> For a review essay on histories of policing and a discussion of these paradigms, see Pisciotta, *Police, Society and Social Control in America: A Metahistorical Review of the Literature*, 14 CRIM. JUST. ABSTRACTS § 14 (1982); see also Lane, *Urban Police and Crime in Nineteenth-Century America*, in CRIME AND JUSTICE: AN ANNUAL REVIEW OF RESEARCH 1 (N. Morris and M. Tonry eds. (1980); Walker, *The Urban Police in American History: A Review of the Literature*, 4 POLICE SCI. & AD. 252 (1976).

socializing, disciplining, and intimidating the working class. In short, local police were a bulwark in the development of post-Civil War capitalism.

Harring's analysis is systematically structured to test and support this thesis. Chapters one and two examine the origin of pre-Civil War police institutions in the Northeast, and then link the development of western law enforcement agencies with the spread of industrialization from 1865-1890. Chapter three argues that the development and proliferation of the police wagon and signal system from 1880 to 1900 markedly enhanced the efficiency and effectiveness of police in their class control efforts. Chapters four and five analyze the differential development and unique class control functions of the police in Buffalo (1865-1900) and Milwaukee (1865-1912), respectively. Chapters six through ten examine specific forms of police class control and repression: strikebreaking, the regulation of liquor consumption, dance halls, gambling, tramping, felonies, and even spitting. The final chapter provides a thought-provoking defense and extension of instrumentalist-Marxist interpretations of police history.

The specifics of the analysis, with few exceptions, offer convincing support for the radical position. Harring uses extant arrest records and other sources to demonstrate that the police did, indeed, focus their law enforcement and order-maintenance activities on the regulation of the urban working class. More importantly, Harring maintains that the police were not, as a number of the police historians have suggested, undisciplined, corrupt, disorganized and ineffective (i.e., cut from the "Keystone cop" mold). Rather, Harring demonstrates that police effectiveness increased significantly from 1865-1915 as forces increased in size, budget, training, and discipline. Although American police did not, in many cases, meet modern standards (or even the standards of their contemporaries in London's Metropolitan Police), they were effective class control agents. "There is no inherent reason why a highly corrupt police department cannot effectively serve the bourgeoisie in the class struggle," concludes Harring (p. 40).

The bulk of the analysis is devoted to developing this proposition by examining the day-to-day and the crisis-related activities of the police. The historical role of the police as strikebreakers is offered as the most blatant manifestation of class control. Harring demonstrates that local police were highly effective in repressing proletarian labor revolts and suggests that it was the local police, and not the state militias, federal troops, or private police, who were the primary defenders of bourgeois interests. Further, felony crime control was not the central activity of the police. Rather, arrest records reveal that the police spent the vast majority of their time socializing and disciplining urban, immigrant

proletarians by enforcing "order maintenance" laws (e.g., alcohol consumption and dance hall activities). Liquor control was not, however, aimed at the regulation of the lumpenproletariat. Rather, it was essentially aimed at making the proletariat internalize the habits of order, discipline, obedience—traits conducive to good work habits, the production of surplus value, and profit. The police also enforced repressive "tramp acts" when capitalism's unemployed "social dynamite" challenged the legitimacy of the system. Harring demonstrates that technological advances, particularly the development and proliferation of the patrol wagon and signal system, facilitated these repressive efforts. Was it a coincidence that the care of the keys to these call boxes was entrusted to the local bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie?

*Policing a Class Society* is not, however, another simplistic, instrumentalist-Marxist police history. Harring presents a dynamic instrumentalist interpretation: the control of local governments and the police, in many instances, was problematic. Even in instances where the working class was politically conscious, active, and powerful (i.e., controlled local political machines), however, the bourgeoisie still prevailed. Case studies of Buffalo (chapter four) and Milwaukee (chapter five) are illustrative. Harring's analysis of social control in Buffalo from 1865-1900 provides an instance where the control of the police was not problematic. Italian and Polish workers were poorly organized and lacked political consciousness and power; hence, the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie openly controlled the local government and police institutions. In contrast, the German workers of Milwaukee were well organized, politically conscious, and did, in fact, secure control of the city council and elect a proletarian sympathizer as mayor. Control of the local political machine did not, however, constitute control of the police. Milwaukee's bourgeoisie circumvented the proletarian political machine by appointing a xenophobic, anti-working class police chief—a position that happened to be a lifetime appointment. Proletarian victories were, in short, often temporary and token. The "relative autonomy" of the police was limited because the bourgeoisie strategically "transformed" Milwaukee's police to serve their interests. "Working-class political activists managed to slow down the direction of police development in Milwaukee," concludes Harring, "but they could not stop it or change its functions" (p. 99).

This work should be of interest to a variety of audiences, particularly radical criminal justice historians. Harring has proposed a number of interesting research questions that merit examination in other temporal and geographical settings. His support for a more sophisticated instrumentalist model—termed a "class struggle model"—is thought-provoking and warrants closer scrutiny. The activities of the police as

strikebreakers, and as regulators of working class crime and vice, should be re-examined in other cities to assess the generalizability of Harring's conclusions. Harring's assessment of the dynamics of proletarian-bourgeoisie conflicts for the control of local governments and police should be tested. More simply, radical historians should attempt to explicate linkages between the infrastructure and superstructure and expose how forms of repression and social control have varied by social context and time.

A number of organizational, theoretical, and methodological criticisms might be leveled against this work. These problems, however, do not significantly detract from the quality of the analysis. *Policing a Class Society: The Experience of American Cities, 1865-1915* is well organized and well written. Most importantly, Harring's arguments are well supported and convincing. *Policing a Class Society* is a significant contribution to the literature on criminal justice history. This work should have a major impact in shaping the direction of future radical police historiography, and it most certainly will be the focus of the rebukes and rebuttals of progressive and social context historians, as well as anti-instrumentalist Marxists. Academicians, undergraduates, graduate students, and practitioners will profit from reading this book and contemplating its themes and implications.

ALEXANDER W. PISCIOTTA  
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL  
JUSTICE AND SOCIAL WELFARE  
KUTZTOWN UNIVERSITY  
KUTZTOWN, PA

WHITE COLLAR CRIME: THE UNCUT VERSION. By *Edwin H. Sutherland* [with intro. by *Gilbert Geis and Colin Goff*]. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1983. Pp. xxxiii, 291. \$30.00.

In 1939, Edwin Sutherland addressed a joint meeting of the American Economic Association and the American Sociological Society. His talk was entitled "The White-Collar Criminal,"<sup>1</sup> and it temporarily shifted academic focus from crime in the streets to crime in the suites. Following his talk, Sutherland labored for another decade to write his manuscript on white-collar crime. Prior to its publication, however, Sutherland came under pressure from his university and his publisher to remove the names and other identifying descriptions of the corporations

---

<sup>1</sup> Sutherland, *The White Collar Criminal*, 5 AM. SOC. REV. 1 (1940).

and officials involved in illegal activity. Sutherland acceded to the pressure, rationalizing in part that expurgation would make his monograph more objective and scientific. In 1949, the world was treated to the first, albeit expurgated, version of *White Collar Crime*.<sup>2</sup>

For those, if any, not familiar with *White Collar Crime*, it is worth noting some of its contributions. First, it upset the popular notion that broken homes, poor education, and similar presumptive handicaps are the sole correlates of criminality. Second, it suggested data that would indicate that middle- and upper-class illegalities are as common as street offenses. Third, it caused a vigorous debate by suggesting that the causes of crime were rooted within the social fabric of society. Although often challenged, *White Collar Crime* is, in short, the source that those interested in white-collar crime must consult.

Now that the term "white-collar crime" is part of the lexicon of the criminologist, that white-collar crime is a documented tradition of widespread scope, and that publishers no longer live in mortal fear of libel suits, corporate names and case histories can be released to restore the Sutherland monograph to its original state. In other words, Sutherland's original study is being published for the first time.

*White Collar Crime: The Uncut Version*, with the names and case histories restored, is a veritable gold mine for researchers interested in white collar and corporate crime. For example, it provides social scientists with the data needed to complete longitudinal-type studies of the illegalities in American corporations. It also makes it possible to draw cross-cultural comparisons between corporate malefactors in this country and those in Europe or Asia. Notwithstanding its well-known theoretical value, *White Collar Crime* is now a valuable data source.

In addition to revealing the names of corporations and officials involved in illegal activities, there are a number of other differences between the 1949 edition and the uncut version. In the expurgated edition, for example, Sutherland writes that he had excluded public utility, transportation, and communications companies from his list of the top seventy American corporations, "as well as the corporations in one other industry" (p. xiv). The new edition identifies this other industry as petroleum. Why Sutherland made the deletion is unclear. The expurgated edition is also missing "a phrase describing corporations as 'rationalistic, a-moral, and non-sentimental'" (p. xiv). Here it is safe to assume that the deletion was made "as part of an attempt to render the book less polemical" (p. xiv).

Another difference is that the uncut version contains an extremely informational introduction written by Gilbert Geis and Colin Goff. In

---

<sup>2</sup> E. SUTHERLAND, *WHITE COLLAR CRIME* (1949).

it, they paint a psychological portrait of Sutherland in much the same way Sigmund Freud and William C. Bullitt did of Woodrow Wilson.<sup>3</sup> We learn, for example, that Sutherland's strong commitment to his work on white-collar crime might have been in response to his father. George Sutherland, a Baptist minister, was a stern disciplinarian, as well as intellectually demanding, unstintingly introspective, and sharply critical of any work that failed to meet his standards. Edwin's upbringing leads Geis and Goff to suggest that there is in Sutherland's work on white-collar crime a "religious commitment that, at its best, demands that the ethics of Christianity be maintained in human and business relationships" (p. xviii). They also suggest that "[p]sychiatrists might insist that Sutherland's work on white-collar crime contains strong oedipal traces: the hostile son turning against the strong and omnipresent father, represented by the powerful corporations" (p. xx).

Geis and Goff also do an excellent job in documenting the history surrounding Sutherland's work on white-collar crime. They take the reader from 1928, when Sutherland said he began collecting materials on white-collar crime, through 1934, when he first used the term *white-collar criminaloid* to link together the terms *crime* and *white collar*, to 1949, when the Dryden Press published *White Collar Crime*. This chronology is replete with anecdotes on how Sutherland, for example, employed graduate students to collect data, agonized over emasculating his manuscript, and dealt with researchers who wrote him requesting the names of the corporate malefactors.

The introduction led Donald R. Cressey to comment, as printed on the dust jacket, that he learned much more about Sutherland from the introduction than he learned from all the years of personal association with him. It, like the book it introduces, is sure to become a classic. In fact, the introduction is so good that it alone is worth the price of the book.

After reading *White Collar Crime: The Uncut Version*, we are even more convinced of the impact of Edwin Sutherland's work on the field of criminology. Psychological revelations aside, it was, after all, Sutherland who coined the term *white-collar crime*, stimulated the generation of much scholarly work, and elevated the debate over the causes of crime to a much higher level of sophistication. Hermann Mannheim, the noted British criminologist, "has written that if there were a Nobel Prize in Criminology, Sutherland undoubtedly would have been awarded it

---

<sup>3</sup> S. FREUD & W. BULLITT, THOMAS WOODROW WILSON, TWENTY-EIGHTH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY (1967).

for his work on white-collar crime" (p. xxxiii). It is a most fitting tribute and epitaph for Edwin Sutherland.

HARVEY W. KUSHNER  
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY  
C.W. POST CAMPUS

CRIMINAL CAREERS VOLUME ONE: EXPLAINING CRIMINALS. By Gwynn Nettler. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co., 1982. Pp. xii, 220. \$12.95.

*Explaining Criminals* is the first volume of *Criminal Careers*, a four-volume textbook intended for students of criminology. *Criminal Careers* "attends to certain crimes as major nodes or characteristics of careers" (p. xi). The author, however, believes that the principles that inform the study have general applicability; that is, they can be applied to the interpretation of any style of life—criminal or lawful. According to Nettler, therefore, the themes of the text provide an introduction to the study of social behavior.

This first volume is divided into two parts: "Themes" and "Causes." The themes discussed in the first part are "prescriptions for thinking about careers, criminal or lawful," and they constitute "assumptions that run like a thread through the substantive chapters" in the remaining three volumes (p. xi). Three themes are introduced. The first is that there are many roads to any particular criminal act. The second is that there are many questions that can be asked about these acts, and many answers that can be given to the multifaceted question "why?". The third theme is that the most practical way to increase foresight (and scientific prediction) is to count continuities with the awareness that all continuities are contingent. Part one concludes with a chapter on the measurement of criminal acts.

The second part of *Explaining Criminals* develops these themes by outlining major causes of human action. Four major causes are discussed: constitutions, the process of learning, the context of learning, and environments. The book concludes with a chapter on selecting causes. The major argument developed in this part of the book is that careers are produced in a dense web of influences.

As an introduction to the study of social behavior in general, and criminal behavior in particular, this book has a number of virtues. First, the discussion of the nature and process of systematic observation in the



social sciences is both sophisticated and simple. Nettler skillfully demonstrates the complexity of issues often taken for granted, such as the asking of scientific questions and the gathering of crime statistics. Yet he also has the ability to dissect more complex issues, such as scientific measurement, and to present them in a clear and understandable way. A second virtue is the clear presentation of the four major categories of sources of action. Although I disagree with Nettler on some of the content of these descriptions, the overview does aid students in sorting out the various causal factors that could be related to criminal behavior. Above all else, this book has the virtues of being well written and loaded with interesting examples.

Despite these virtues, my overall reaction to this book is a negative one. There are four reasons for this reaction. First, Nettler often fails to specifically relate the discussions in the book back to the issue of crime. Although these more general comments on the study of social life and the issue of social causation are not inappropriate in and of themselves, they need to be better connected to the particular issue of crime in a textbook designed for criminology students. I suspect that this may be a problem only when volume one is examined separately from the other volumes, as I have examined it.

The second reason for my negative reaction is the extreme positivistic conception of science that Nettler adheres to in this book. Many sociologists no longer share Nettler's narrow empiricist view of sociological theory and his conclusion that prediction is the ultimate goal of scientific endeavor. Nettler has either ignored alternative conceptions of science, as represented by interpretive or dialectical paradigms, or has described them in such a way that they become caricatures.

The third reason is related to the second. Nettler fails to address the underlying presuppositions embedded in his work. According to Jeffery Alexander this is a key failing of most positivistic thought in sociology.<sup>1</sup> Presuppositions, as the generalized elements of sociological thought, are an important part of the scientific process and need to be discussed explicitly, especially in a general textbook. For example, a student reading this book would have no idea of the fundamental disagreement between criminologists concerning the subject matter of the field. Most criminologists, it is true, adopt a behavioral approach to crime similar to the one that Nettler uses. This approach assumes that crime is a distinctive kind of behavior that is intrinsically real, objectively given, and caused by antecedent factors. This leads criminologists to attempt to describe, explain, and control conduct taken for granted as criminal.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. ALEXANDER, *POSITIVISM, PRESUPPOSITIONS, AND CURRENT CONTROVERSIES* (1982).

This paradigmatic framework, however, has been challenged by those who adopt a different set of presuppositions. The labeling or definitional paradigm assumes that no behavior is intrinsically criminal, that crime is not a distinctive type of behavior, but a label or a subjective definition that is attached to certain acts and certain actors. Crime is, therefore, a social construction that is inherently political and rooted in social conflict. These assumptions lead criminologists to study the process whereby criminal labels are created and applied. Presuppositions shape the nature of criminological work and should be addressed explicitly. Nettler fails to make clear the presuppositions that guide his work.

Finally, I had a negative reaction to the subtle ideological statements Nettler sprinkles throughout the text. These ideological statements are unacknowledged as such and are often presented as scientific "truths." Most of these statements convey the conservative message that the present social system should not be altered in any fundamental way. Nettler argues, for example, that sociologists know very little about the causes of social action, therefore we should "not count on great or good changes in human relations effected according to plan" (p. 35). Elsewhere, he argues that his notion of a "dense causal web" makes do-gooders uncomfortable "because social reform and . . . social revolution are easier to justify if one poses a few, non-interacting causes of the evils to be corrected" (p. 155). Nettler goes on to note that "[t]he probable density of the causes of the events that concern us raises the possibility that solving problems creates them" (p. 155). Finally, Nettler raises the issue of political preference and causal location only as he begins to discuss environmental causes, while he himself devotes much more attention to individualistic causes of crime than to structural and cultural ones.

RONALD C. KRAMER  
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

THE LIMITS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT. By *Hans Zeisel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982. Pp. xii, 245. \$20.00.

This book attempts to illuminate exactly why the criminal justice system is extremely limited in its battle against (street) crime. From New York City data, Professor Zeisel quantitatively analyzes almost 2,000 cases from arrest through disposition. The true contribution of the piece, however, seems to lie in its qualitative analysis of almost 400

additional cases, comprising interviews with the involved attorneys, judges, and police. This latter sample has allowed the author to infer the reasons why certain outcomes exist, rather than merely to present a description of those outcomes.

Zeisel seems to have done well in his effort to make the work readable for the criminal justice practitioner, the public, and the academic criminologist. The book is replete with easily understandable area histograms to aid the reader in following the author's assertions. The piece is functionally couched in terms of the present capacities and philosophies of the criminal justice system; it does not in any way present a "new" criminology.

The book contains five parts. Rather than present data first and conclusions last, Zeisel instead begins with his "Summary and Reflections." This initial section, which seems to constitute the meat of the book, describes low arrest rates, high dismissal rates, the bail system, plea bargains, crime reduction through sentencing (general deterrence, incapacitation), and Zeisel's perceptions about the "causes of crime." Each of these descriptions is accompanied by a policy analysis. The following three sections ("Crimes and Arrests," "The Dispositions," and "Close Ups") lay the foundation for the author's earlier reflective commentary. These three sections include the indepth interview data described above. The final section of the book takes on specific problem areas the author has encountered, including police charging practices, offender drug involvement, the bail system, and criminal justice statistics.

Zeisel's reflections begin with the paucity of arrests relative to the number of criminal events committed; his New York City data, however, considerably underrepresent national arrest rates.<sup>1</sup> Citing studies from the Police Foundation, Zeisel concludes that low arrest rates cannot be increased because offenders too often escape identification. Dismissal rates are difficult to reduce because of the large number of principal complaining witnesses who fail to cooperate after a suspect has been arrested. Somewhat of a reduction in dismissals could result from additional corroborating evidence gathered by the police and development of victim/witness services that would reduce their costs of participating in the criminal justice process (e.g., minimizing lost time from employment). Reforms notwithstanding, however, low arrest rates and

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Uniform Crime Reports* for 1973 (a representative year of Zeisel's data) shows the arrest rates for homicide and assault to be 68.8%, 27% for robbery, and 17.5% for burglary, auto theft, and larceny. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, CRIME IN THE UNITED STATES 118 (Uniform Crime Reports 1973). Zeisel reports the following arrest rates for these categories in New York City to be, respectively, 47%, 20%, and 8%. H. ZEISEL, *THE LIMITS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT* 30 (1982).

high dismissal rates probably cannot be improved noticeably. Although Zeisel's outlook for the criminal justice system throughout the book is bleak, his results certainly are not surprising.

The author's analysis of plea bargaining is particularly well done because it quantifies the positive and negative ramifications of one's plea. For example, as a benefit to the defendant, of all cases in which charges were reduced in conjunction with a guilty plea, 60% were reduced because of evidence deterioration since the time of arrest, and the average reduction of charges in these cases was 2.8 crime classes (according to the New York penal code). In the remaining 40% of the cases in which there was no deterioration of evidence, the average charge reduction was 1.6 crime classes. On the other hand, the "cost" to the defendants who plead not guilty is an increase in incarceration time of over 100%. The author concludes that as a means for reducing system capacity, prosecutors will increase the threatened sentence differential (between a guilty plea and trial conviction) and thereby scare offenders into pleading guilty prior to trial.

Unfortunately, some of Zeisel's policy analyses are rather weak, at least from this reviewer's perspective. The discussion of the study's implications for an incapacitation policy ignores entirely the libertarians' objection to the denial of equity and proportionality in such a policy.<sup>2</sup> False positives are virtually ignored throughout the book. The discussion of bail under the "Reflections" section implies (or at least this reviewer infers) that preventive detention is a legitimate aim in the denial of bail. Here, Zeisel not only is in conflict with the Bail Reform Act of 1966, but he also ignores the false positive in his concern for eliminating false negatives.<sup>3</sup>

Zeisel is pragmatic, but simplistic, in his ideas for reducing crime. For short-term crime prevention, Zeisel believes in more locks and fewer guns. For long-term crime prevention, Zeisel believes we must solve "the problem of our ghettos" (p. 86).

*The Limits of Law Enforcement* provides a good empirical analysis of the day-to-day workings of the criminal justice system, despite some of its policy discussions. The analysis of interviews by Zeisel contributes reasons *why* the system operates as it does (at least in New York City); it is a refreshing change from mere aggregated results currently found in

---

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Von Hirsch, *Giving Criminals Their Just Deserts*, 3 CIVIL LIB. REV. 23 (1976); Von Hirsch, *Prediction of Criminal Conduct and Preventive Confinement of Convicted Persons*, 21 BUFFALO L. REV. 717 (1982).

<sup>3</sup> Zeisel flirts with support for a libertarian position, however, in his discussion of general deterrence by pointing out that we may not have the right to punish an individual based on what others may or may not do in the future. H. ZEISEL, *THE LIMITS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT* 68 (1982).

the plethora of quantitative criminology. For teaching, the book would be excellent in both graduate and undergraduate courses dealing with the politics of the judicial process (excluding the penal system). For general edification, the book can be read easily by criminal justice practitioners and a concerned public. I might also suggest that the academic criminologist give this book a good look, because it lays out quite clearly where the more fruitful research agendas (in street crime) should be oriented.

GARY S. GREEN  
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
THE UNIVERSITY OF EVANSVILLE

**THEFT BY EMPLOYEES.** By *Richard C. Hollinger and John P. Clark*. Lexington, Kentucky: D.C. Heath and Company (Lexington Books), 1983. Pp. xvii, 146. \$21.95.

When Edwin Sutherland first articulated his concept of "white-collar crime" in 1939, it was something of a revelation to sociologists, although it should not have been considering the probable extent of such deviant behavior, even in those days. Until recent decades, however, social scientists of criminological bent, with their traditional myopic perspective, continued to focus their attention largely on street crime and other highly visible modes of criminal activity. Since then, of course, voluminous literature on occupational crime has developed and the generic label of white-collar crime has evolved into a veritable rainbow of sub-categories (i.e., blue-collar crime, blue-coat crime, khaki-collar crime, etc.). The many articles and books on this topic have been of mixed quality and utility. The book reviewed here is an addition to the literature in this field and promises to be valuable both because of its scope and its research design.

*Theft By Employees* is not a synthesis of the literature on organizational crime or an overview of past research, as the title might suggest, but rather is the account and findings of an extensive empirical study of employee theft conducted by the authors. They assert that much past research has relied heavily on qualitative case studies that often have looked only at employee theft in a single company. Such research, they contend, has yielded "colorful anecdotal findings" that are, unfortunately, inadequate, particularly in regard to questions concerning representativeness and generalizability. The authors, therefore, elect not to rely on existing data sources as the basis for their research, but instead

elect to develop a new, different, and "innovative" research data-collection effort.

After an initial overview chapter that explores the nature and extent of employee theft in the work place today, and after a preliminary discussion that examines five "separate but interrelated sets" of hypotheses identified from the literature that help to explain employee theft, the authors move on to outline their research design and project. In this regard, the authors indicate their plan to generate three complementary data sets based on: 1) a self-report questionnaire survey of employees, 2) interviews with organizational executives, and 3) face-to-face employee interviews. Beyond this, their design included a two-phase research methodology. In the first phase, the authors limited their study to "the organizations and the work force of one community in three differing industry sectors" (p. 17). In the second phase of the project, they undertook to replicate the study "within two alternate communities in addition to conducting the qualitative face-to-face employee interviews" (p. 17).

In Phase I, the research was confined to the Minneapolis-St. Paul Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area and included thirty-five organizations, including nine retailers, ten manufacturing firms, and sixteen hospitals. In Phase II, the research effort was broadened to include two additional major metropolitan areas—Dallas-Forth Worth, Texas, and Cleveland, Ohio. In these communities, the research concentrated on two of the three industry sectors that had been used in the Minneapolis-St. Paul phase of the study—retail stores and hospitals. In this phase, a total of twelve organizations were studied, including four retail stores in Dallas-Forth Worth and three in Cleveland, in addition to two hospitals in Dallas-Forth Worth, and three in Cleveland. Over a three year period, data from the three collection procedures—the self-report employee questionnaires, executive interviews, and face-to-face employee interviews—were gathered and analyzed. This data provided the basis for testing the previously mentioned hypotheses concerning employee theft. Each of the hypotheses is addressed in a separate chapter of the book.

One of these hypotheses raised the question of external economic pressure on employees, causing them to become involved in theft. Another addressed the question of the honesty, integrity, and work motivation of younger workers. The remaining three hypotheses were based on opportunity structure, the job satisfaction of the employees, and certain organizational control efforts. The data supported some of the hypotheses, even if in a qualified fashion, but failed to support others. Beyond the testing of the various hypotheses concerning employee theft, the authors also explored the broader area of employee deviance with regard

to the operational definitions of property and production deviance by employees and the interpretive management of such deviance by supervisors.

By way of summary, the authors conclude that theft occurred only with about one-third of the employees in the industry sectors that they studied, and that most of the theft reported was neither very serious nor very frequent. Other types of employee deviancy, however, broadly categorized as counter-productive behaviors or production deviance, were more widespread. Both property theft and counter-productive behavior would appear to be more the result of factors intrinsic, rather than extrinsic, to the work setting.

This volume documents an ambitious research project that was both well designed and well implemented. Studies such as this one have been needed and additional research of similar scale will continue to be needed. On the bases of past research in the area, however, the authors' findings are perhaps not particularly surprising. Employees are apt to engage in theft and other kinds of deviant behavior more because of dissatisfaction with their work situation than because of the prospect of economic gain. It is relatively easy to redefine a situation and, thus, more easily dilute the guilt attendant to such behavior. This process is aided by a supporting and/or rationalizing value system on the part of the other employees. Furthermore, such an informal culture in the work place also aids in disguising or hiding the theft or deviancy.

There have always been those who were critical of the validity of self-report survey questionnaires, as well as interview data, particularly when probing deviant behavior. Such data simply may not tell the whole story. The authors themselves admit that this study has "concentrated on a limited aspect of the total work system: the subjective perceptions of individual employees" (p. 86). Nevertheless, the same could be said about a substantial proportion of all sociological research. Additional research of other varieties will no doubt provide the necessary triangulation.

The book is well organized and well written. Because that the study examines employee theft and deviance in almost 50 organizations in three different industry sectors in three geographical areas, it is an important research effort. Because they support some of our most popular hypotheses concerning employee theft, the findings also make the book important. No doubt it will be widely cited, and will serve as the basis and/or model for additional large-scale studies. It is likely that scholars in the field of occupational and organizational crime and deviance will find the book useful in developing their own future research

plans. Similarly, students will find it useful in enhancing their own understanding of the organizational context of such behavior.

CLIFTON BRYANT  
DEPT. OF SOCIOLOGY  
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

RESPONDING TO CRIME. By *Gwynn Nettler*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co., 1982. Pp. v, 191. \$12.95.

Although we are not sure what impact the criminal justice system has on crime, it is evident that crime has an impact on the appearance and behaviors of the criminal justice system. The civil disturbances of the 1960's led to cries and political pledges for law and order, which in turn led to the establishment of the infamous Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). It ostensibly provided funds to modernize and retool the criminal justice system to bolster efforts to impose law and order on our disordered society. It is questionable what impact, if any, LEAA had on law and order and crime. Nettler presents us with a rather thorough and straightforward description and analysis of our "modes of responding to crime and the justification." (p. xii) In addition, he discusses the impact our response to crime may have on crime and the criminal offender. He begins by discussing the social bases that prompt our need for justice, as well as our difficulty in clearly defining or concurring on notions of justice. This is followed by a discussion of the development and meaning of criminal law, after which he highlights the inconsistencies in our application of the law. The balance of the book, spent on the methods and results of dealing with offenders, includes brief but rather concise outlines of the efficacy of incapacitation and alternatives, our skill—or more importantly, our lack of skill—at predicting dangerous offenders, the effect of both specific and general deterrence, and the impact of our attempts to correct criminal offenders. He concludes with a brief chapter on prescriptions for the system. Throughout, a rich assortment of research is used in the examination of the programs devised to deal with crime and the criminal offender.

For the most part, the analysis presented is objective and balanced. Occasionally, however, Nettler's biases and personal feelings surface in spite of his desire to give a balanced assessment of our modes of responding to crime. His views are presented as such, and usually are not hidden in the fabric of the material at hand, but generally are put forth as conclusions. At the end of the first chapter, for example, he prescribes



that "it would be economical and just, if restitutive contracts could assume a larger role in the response to crime". (p. 23) He logically concludes that "social policy in response to crime will continue to be impelled more by what we want to do than by what the doing achieves" (p. 101). Using Paul Meehl's notion of "fire side inductions,"<sup>1</sup> Nettler takes a delightful slap at social science research and researchers who conclude that punishment is not a deterrent to criminal behavior. Quoting Meehl, we are advised that, "[t]he same psychologist who says punishment does not deter relies on deterrence in posting a sign in the department library stating that if a student removed a Journal without permission, his privilege to use the room will be suspended but his fee not returned."<sup>2</sup>

For the most part, Nettler examines the technical and programmatic responses to crime and the rationales for those responses. He does link the responses to society-based demands, especially when discussing the difficulty in prescribing justice in a democratic society. He gives little attention, however, to the political linkages between society and our criminal justice institutions. Although an in-depth discussion of the politics of criminal justice is beyond the scope of this book, some attention could have been paid to the role that the criminal justice system plays in legitimizing the existing governmental structure, and the subsequent impact that role has on the development of the modes of responding to crime. It seems, for example, that the emergence of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration as a political response to crime would have been a rich topic to bring into any discussion about responses to crime. Although it can be argued that LEAA was primarily intended as a political gesture—hypocrisy may be the way Nettler would caption its emergence—it did spread around large and unexpected amounts of funds ostensibly intended to develop and advance our methods of responding to crime. Debate continues on its technical and operational impact, as well as on what effect, if any, it had on crime.

In his brief chapter on prescriptions, Nettler suggests that we understand hypocrisy as the "normal response to moral conflict" (p. 151). Here, perhaps, he misses an opportunity to address the political linkages between social demands and our criminal justice institutions, and an opportunity to tie in the conclusion of the work with the beginning of the work. In a society with such varying views of justice and just responses to crime, is it hypocrisy or political necessity to protect the legitimate appearance of government by updating and presenting broadly

---

<sup>1</sup> Meehl, *Law and The Fireside Inductions: Some Reflections of a Clinical Psychologist* in LAW, JUSTICE, AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN SOCIETY: PSYCHOLOGICAL AND LEGAL ISSUES 10 (Z. Tapp and F. Levine eds. 1977).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 12.

stated symbolic language as objectives to the mixed constituency? For those who dominate our criminal justice institutions, the posture and status of the organization is as important, if not more important, than the goals or the effectiveness of the processing technology. For this reason, it is likely that Nettler's prescription to reduce policing of vice is generations away from credibility. The economic logic of the sale and use of drugs dictates that laws prohibiting the sale and use of certain drugs should be abolished. Economic and social logic will be ignored, however, in favor of political logic that dictates the necessity of our criminal justice institutions taking a public stand against what is perceived by most members of society as evil.

By and large, I found Nettler's book interesting, thorough, rich in references to research, and at times delightful reading—a very clear and concise job.

DAVID B. KALINICH  
SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH SOURCES. By *Robert L. O'Block*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company, 1983. Pp. 121. \$7.95.

The text is a comprehensive handbook of research sources available in the criminal justice field. Not only is it written clearly and simply enough for use by the beginning researcher, but it is also complete enough to be useful for those at a more advanced level.

The author explains that the text is set up as if the student were being taken through the steps of a literature search. The first section deals with book sources and is followed by sections concerning the use of indexing services, journals, bibliographies, computerized searches, etc. Each of the fourteen sections includes a descriptive introduction to the particular category of information, as well as a brief description of most of the individual sources listed. The manner in which the book is organized is helpful because it offers a broad range of information and expedites the reader's abilities to choose sources most applicable to his or her needs.

As a graduate student, I am aware of the great need for such a book. Throughout their undergraduate and graduate work, most students are expected to conduct research without an awareness of the vast amount of information available and the ways to gather it. Many students never progress beyond using books and *The Reader's Guide to Periodi-*

*cal Literature* to gather their information. If this handbook were made available to these students, I feel that many of the sources of frustration associated with conducting research could be alleviated. Even students who are experienced in doing research can benefit from *Criminal Justice Research Sources* because it is unlikely that many people are familiar with all of the sources listed in this volume. It is a valuable addition to the library of anyone seriously interested in research in criminal justice.

NANETTE JEMILLO  
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS  
UNIVERSITY — CARBONDALE

